DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

Lori E Wright Attorney Federal Advocacy

1133 Nineteenth Street, NW Washington, DC 20036



RECEIVED

202 736-6468 Fax 202 736-6359

September 24, 2003

SEP 2 4 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Ms Marlene Dortch Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W Washington, D.C 20554

Re: In the Matter of Qwest Communications International, Inc. Application for Authority to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Arizona; WC Docket No. 03-194

Dear Ms. Dortch.

MCI hereby comments on Qwest's application for long-distance authority in Arizona, the last state in its region for which Qwest seeks section 271 authorization. In MCI's experience, Qwest's OSS has been the most deficient in the country and has resulted in reject rates higher than in any other BOC region. Since entering the local market in the Qwest region, MCI has had to engage in lengthy trial-and-error processes that required MCI to expend significant resources in deciphering Qwest's poor documentation and non-standard OSS. Through these efforts MCI's reject level in the Qwest region has been reduced to 29% (as of the week of September 15, 2003) for residential customers, down from the 50% reject rate that existed several months ago during the Minnesota section 271 proceeding. Nevertheless, a 29% reject rate is too high and remains higher than any other BOC region of the country.

The primary reasons for these reject rates relate to Qwest's requirement that CLECs provide a full-service address on maintenance orders, and Qwest's requirement that CLECs include the correct customer code on orders, which is a Qwest code that changes after CLECs submit their initial migration orders. MCI will not repeat here its arguments associated with these issues, which we have explained in prior Qwest section 271 proceedings.

Instead we identify important deficiencies in Qwest's change management plan that Qwest has refused to correct in recent weeks. Specifically, Qwest's change management document lacks sufficient language to require that Qwest correct software defects within a specific timeframe. Without such language, CLECs have no guarantees that software defects will be fixed in a timely manner. MCI initiated a change request in April 2003 seeking a requirement that Qwest provide these timeframes. All CLECs voted in favor of this request, but because the Qwest change management plan requires a unanimous vote in order for a request to

LIST A B C D E

be approved, Qwest's vote against it resulted in the change request not passing.

In addition, AT&T initiated a change request seeking a log of all system defects, which would allow CLECs to track defects in a single document. All BOCs except Qwest provide such a log, which allows CLECs to understand what problems have occurred as part of a software release, when those problems will be corrected, and how CLECs are impacted. Such a document allows the tracking of corrections to problems and allows CLECs to anticipate customer problems. Qwest's response has been that each CLEC should just compile piecemeal the "Event Notifications" published by Qwest—But this would be a tedious effort that could easily result in maccuracies—More importantly, without a log of defects with definitive fix dates, CLECs will be unable to plan their own systems corrections or understand what order types will fail until those defects are resolved—Nevertheless, Qwest denied this change request.

We urge the Commission to require Qwest to provide CLECs with timeframes for fixing software defects so that CLECs have some assurance that they will be fixed, and a defect log so that CLECs can easily track outstanding defects.

If you have any questions about this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me

Sincerely,

Lori Wright

202-736-6468

cc Aaron Goldberger Ryan Harsch Maureen Scott Janice Myles Gary Remondino